Remarks

Claims are 1-20 pending, and claims 1-20 stand rejected. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request allowance of claims 1-20.

Claims 1-3, 6, 9-13, 16, 19, and 20 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting. A terminal disclaimer is included with this response.

Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nelson et al. (US 6,262,992). Claim 1 requires:

1) A method of operating a telecommunication network, the method comprising: in a switching system, routing a call to a service platform;

in the service platform, transferring a prompt message over the call, <u>collecting</u> <u>caller-entered information from a caller over the call in response to the prompt message</u>, and transferring the caller-entered information to a Service Control Point (SCP) system;

in the SCP system, <u>transferring the caller-entered information to a destination</u> <u>processor</u>, receiving a destination routing code from the destination processor, processing the destination routing code from the destination processor to determine a destination routing instruction, and transferring the destination routing instruction to the switching system; and

in the switching system, routing the call to a destination in response to the destination routing instruction (Underline added).

Nelson does not teach "collecting caller-entered information from a caller over the call in response to the prompt message". In fact Nelson does not send a prompt message to the caller at all. The caller in Nelson may initiate a call trigger (see column 11 lines 50 - 55). But the caller is not prompted for more information after the initiation of the call trigger. Because the caller is not prompted in Nelson, there can not be any caller-entered information collected in response to the prompt message. Therefore Claim 1 is allowable as written.

Claim 1 also requires "transferring the caller-entered information to a destination processor". Nelson does not have any caller-information (see discussion above). Therefore

Nelson can not transfer the caller-entered information to a destination processor as required by claim 1. Therefore claim 1 is allowable as written.

Claim 11 has the limitations "collect caller-entered information from a caller over the call in response to the prompt message" and "transfer the caller-entered information to a destination processor", therefore the argument for claim 1 apply to claim 11 and claim 11 is allowable as written.

Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voit et al. (US 5,696,809) in view of Becker (US 5,680,488). Claim 1 requires routing the call to a service platform from the switching system. The switching system in Voit does not route the call to a service platform. The switching system in Voit transfers the call to an AIN SCP. Claim 1 requires the service platform to prompt the user. Voit does not use a service platform to prompt the user. The AIN SCP in Voit is the device that prompts the user. Claim 1 requires the service platform to transfer the user collected data to a service control point (SCP). In Voit the AIN SCP is the device that collected the data so Voit does not use a service platform to transfer the user collected data to the SCP. Claim 1 requires the SCP to transfer the user collected information to a destination processor. Voit does not have a destination processor. Becker does not transfer user collected information to the destination processor. Because of the reasons listed above, claim 1 is allowable as written. The arguments for claim 1 apply to claim 11 and claim 11 is therefore also allowable.

Claims 2 - 10 depend on allowable claim 1 and are therefore allowable.

Claims 12 - 20 are dependent on allowable claim 11 and are therefore allowable.

Conclusion

Based on the above remarks, the Applicants submit that claims 1-20 are allowable. There may be additional reasons in support of patentability, but such reasons are omitted in the interests of brevity. The Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1-20.

Any fees may be charged to deposit account 21-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/18/05

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Steven L. Webb, Reg. No. 44,395

FAX NO. 3039389995

Setter Ollila LLC

Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 22

Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Attn: Harley R. Ball 6391 Sprint Parkway

Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100 Overland Park, KS 66251-2100